

Venable, Baetjer, Howard & Civiletti, LLP  
1201 New York Avenue, N.W., Suite 1000  
Washington, D.C. 20005-3917  
Telephone No. (202) 962-4800  
Telecopier No. (202) 962-8300

Client No. 33144-177550  
User No. 2030

**FAX RECEIVED**

Date of Fax: February 24, 2003

FEB 24 2003

Number of Pages: 10 (not including this coversheet)

Name & Number of Sender: Fei-Fei Chao (202) 216-8011

**T.C. 2800**

CONFIDENTIALITY NOTICE

**WARNING:** Unauthorized interception of this telephonic communication could be a violation of Federal and State Law. The documents accompanying this telecopy transmission contain confidential information belonging to the sender and are legally privileged. The information is intended only for the use of the individual or entity named above. If you are not the intended recipient, you are hereby notified that any disclosure, copying, distribution or the taking of any action in reliance on the contents of this telecopied information is strictly prohibited. If you have received this telecopy in error, please immediately notify us by telephone to arrange for return of the original documents to us.

---

Recipient	Firm	Fax No.	Tel. No.
Examiner Karl Tammi	USPTO	(703) 746-4173	

MESSAGE:

## IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Applicants: Hsin-Mao Hsieh

Serial No. 10/034,116

Filing Date: January 3, 2002

For: STATOR OF AN  
ALTERNATING CURRENT  
MOTOR

Group Art Unit: 2834

Examiner:  
PHAM, Leda T

Customer No.

\*26694\*

26694

PATENT TRADEMARK OFFICE

Atty. Docket No. 33144-177550

AMENDMENT AFTER FINALHonorable Commissioner for Patents  
Washington, D.C. 20231  
Box: Amendment After FinalFAX RECEIVED  
FEB 24 2003  
T.C. 2800

Sir:

This amendment is responsive to the Final Office Action dated August 21, 2002. On November 15, 2002, Applicant filed a response to the Final Office Action. On December 5, 2003, an advisory action was mailed, which denied entry of Applicant's response. On January 10, 2003, Applicant filed a Notice of Appeal. On February 24, 2003, an interview between Applicant's counsel and Examiners Pham and Tamni took place. In concluding the interview, Examiner Tamni recommended that Applicant submit this Amendment After Final to clarify the ambiguity of the advisory action and further distinguish Applicant's claimed invention from the reference cited by Examiner Pham in the remark.